MEMORANDUM

Date: March 30, 2022

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: Jan Lesher
Acting County Administrator

Re: Redistricting Update

Attached please find the latest redistricting update, as well as current maps under consideration. The Redistricting Advisory Committee’s next meeting will be in-person on Wednesday, April 6, from 3-6pm in the Board hearing room.

JKL
Attachment

cc: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Francisco García, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services
Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator
Diana Durazo, Special Projects Manager, County Administrator’s Office
Date: March 29, 2022

To: Jan Lesher
Acting County Administrator

From: Diana Durazo
Special Projects Manager
County Administrator’s Office

Re: Redistricting Update

The Redistricting Advisory Committee held their fourth meeting on March 23, 2022. Attached is the draft meeting summary. Previously, the Committee agreed on the general objective of maintaining the integrity of the existing districts in developing a final recommended map(s), while meeting the required state and federal redistricting law. Based on discussions at their last meeting, the Committee agreed to use map Option 2, which had been initially submitted to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) as a sample map, as the base map for additional map iterations as it generally followed the Committee’s overall objectives. Briefly, Option 2 moved 10 precincts to balance the population, maintained the overall integrity of the districts, considered geographic boundaries, united most of Sahuarita into one district, did not move incumbents out of home districts, and had a maximum population deviation of 4.1 percent, which is well within the 10 percent statutory requirement.

Committee members and an undisclosed party developed Options 2a, 2b and 3a for Committee review and consideration. The Towns of Marana and Sahuarita also submitted comments requesting that their respective jurisdictions not be divided into multiple districts. The Town of Marana requested that Marana be fully consolidated and moved into District 3. The Sahuarita Town Council voted to support map option 2b, as their preference is to have fewer Board of Supervisor Districts and preserve communities of interest within the Town. Three additional public comments received opposed moving precinct 84 (Quail Creek) from District 4 into District 2. Staff received map option 2d right before the meeting for the Committee’s consideration, and map option 2e was created during the meeting.

After much discussion, the Committee arrived at three preferred Options: maps 2b, 2d and 2e. After the meeting, staff received updates to 2d, in the form of 2d.2, which replaces 2d. In addition, two new maps - Options 2.b.1 and 4 – were received by staff late last week.

Attached please find copies of current maps under consideration, 2b, 2d.2, 2e, 2.b.1 and 4, as well as the corresponding demographic and voter registration data. These maps and data will be available on the County’s web page shortly, and will be considered at the Committee’s April 6, 2022 meeting. Additionally, it is our understanding that the County Attorney’s Office will provide updated legal advice regarding the redistricting process at the April 5th Board meeting.
The Committee’s meeting on April 6, 2022 will be held in person in the BOS hearing room from 3-6pm, with the intent to arrive at a final recommended map or maps after the public hearing. If enough progress is made, another meeting may not be necessary. However, if needed, another meeting can be scheduled that will still meet the Committee’s end of April timeline.

DD

Attachments

c: Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator
1. Roll Call

Chairman Lynn called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum of 4 members. Mr. Hecker joined at 4:07 pm after approval of the meeting summary.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of March 2, 2022 Meeting Summary

MOTION: Dr. Lee moved, seconded by Vice-Chair Romero, to approve the March 2, 2022 meeting summary. Motion approved 4-0.

4. Map Options – Staff Presentation and Committee Discussion, Deliberation and Possible Action

Chairman Lynn introduced this item and asked how the Committee would like to proceed. Mr. Antenori cited the Towns of Marana and Sahuarita’s comments, stated that Option 2b met their preferences the closest, and suggested the Committee focus on that map along with some changes he would be offering.

Dr. Lee submitted Option 2d, right before the meeting, which meant the full data set was not yet available. Dr. Lee said she respected the towns’ comments, but as an elected official she found value in maintaining the integrity of the existing districts and the relationships between those constituents and their representatives. Dr. Lee said the impetus for Option 2d was to give more of the incorporated City of Tucson area to District 1, which currently is largely unincorporated.

Nicole Fyffe, County Administrator’s office, was asked to summarize Option 2 since the other options being discussed are all variations of Option 2. Ms. Fyffe explained that Option 1 and 2 were developed by staff prior to the formation of this Committee.
as samples to show new Board of Supervisor members the mechanics of redistricting. Ms. Fyffe stated that the main objectives for Option 2 were to reduce the max population between districts more than Option 1, improve the alignment of districts along geographic boundaries or features (I-10 between D1 and D3, Sabino Creek between D1 and D4, and Park Avenue between D2 and D5), as well as consolidating most of the Town of Sahuarita into one district. Option 2 has a max population deviation of 4.1%, moves 10 precincts, and has almost no impact on demographics, voter registration and party registration. Voting age population and Citizen Voting Age Population for minorities did decrease by 3 percent for District 2, but at this point this is not concerning.

Mr. Hecker clarified that Option 2 still shows Marana and Sahuarita in two districts.

Ms. Fyffe noted that Option 2 does not move incumbents out of their home districts.

Chairman Lynn introduced Option 2b since he authored Option 2b. His objectives with Option 2b were to move as much of Marana and Sahuarita into one district – noting that not all of Marana and Sahuarita are within one district in Option 2b, balancing population closely (max pop deviation of 0.7%), with hardly any change to demographics with respect to impacting the ability of minorities to elect their candidate of choice.

Vice-Chair Romero observed that Option 2b moves Pima Community College incumbent Catherine Ripley from District 1 to District 3 by moving precinct 127 in Marana. Chairman Lynn stated that it was not his objective to maintain PCC incumbents in their home districts. Dr. Lee observed that Option 2b puts more minorities in D5, which is already a majority-minority district and that she thinks the Committee should be balancing minorities amongst the other districts that have lower minority populations. Mr. Antenori observed that by looking at the population data, District 1, 3 and 4 are growing, whereas District 2 and District 5 are not, and therefore the Committee may want to draw a map that allows us to grow into the one person one vote provision over time, and that the changes he was going to recommend were to this end.

Dr. Lee reiterated her preference to maintain the relationships between constituents and their existing representative that would be changed if the integrity of the districts were changed more significantly, like in Option 2b. Mr. Antenori acknowledged Dr. Lee’s preference, but stated that he was supportive of Option 2b and the objective of keeping communities of interest, towns, and school districts in the same Board district, which also may make petition signing and ballot printing easier.

Vice-Chair Romero stated that he appreciated Chairman Lynn’s ability to achieve such a low max population deviation with Option 2b. However, District 5 has an interest in preserving relationships with Tucson Mountain Park and Saguaro National Park, which are part of that District’s identity. This area was identified as precinct 151, with a population of 1,474. Chairman Lynn stated that this is a low population precinct and that it would be relatively easy to move that back to District 5 without impacting the population balance too much. There was discussion about the pros and cons of moving precinct 99 to D5, but that may increase the population of District 5.
too much.

The Committee then moved on to viewing Option 2b in DistrictR so that changes could be made. Mr. Antenori read off a list of 18 precincts to move from one district to another and Erik Glenn, Pima County GIS Analyst, made those changes. This included the moving of precinct 151 (containing Tucson Mountain Park and Saguaro National Park) back to District 5. This new version of Option 2 was then saved and shared on DistrictR as Option 2e. The max population deviation for 2e is 2.73%. Mr. Antenori stated that these changes are a result of comments from Sahuarita and discussions with people from Green Valley that would move all of Sahuarita into District 4 and in return move a number of precincts in the Northeast side of District 2 from District 4 to District 2. The Committee discussed other possible changes to balance the population and requested the standard demographic and minority population analysis.

Dr. Lee requested for the next meeting the population of the unincorporated areas in comparison to the incorporated, for all the map options. Dr. Lee stated that the incorporated areas have representation from city and town councils, but for those in the unincorporated areas the Board of Supervisors is their only representation.

Dr. Romero inquired as to the reason behind moving precincts 231 and 140 from District 2 to District 4 in option 2e, as they are outside of the Town of Sahuarita’s boundary. Mr. Antenori responded that he moved those to accommodate the Town’s possible future annexation.

The Committee then moved on to viewing Option 2d, recently developed by Dr. Lee. Dr. Lee stated that her intent was to retain the integrity of the existing districts under Option 2, with a max population deviation of less than 1%, and it gives more City of Tucson representation to District 1. Dr. Lee said that Option 2d also increases the minority population in Districts 1, 3 and 4, diversifying the most homogeneous districts 1 and 4. Vice-Chair Romero asked what it does to Districts 2 and 5 based on their demographics. Dr. Lee responded that the minority CVAP increases in Districts 2 and 5. Vice-Chair Romero asked for that data. Mr. Antenori identified one issue that he saw with this option, precinct 188 (3,900 people) is moved into District 4 from District 1, but is isolated on the other side of the Catalina Mountains. Vice-Chair Romero expressed concern that District 5 would be losing the Pascua Yaqui reservation as Option 2d moves it from District 5 to District 3.

Mr. Hecker stated that he’s considering this information, will digest before the next meeting, and is interested in the incorporated vs unincorporated population figures. Mr. Antenori asked for that data to be broken out by individual city and towns as well.

Chairman Lynn expressed his appreciation to the Committee for arriving at three preferred options, and stated that it was his hope at the next meeting that the Committee take votes to reduce the number of maps to a smaller number and get to a recommendation that a majority of the Committee members can support. The Committee discussed meeting in person for the next meeting of April 6 in the Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, from 3-6 pm, with the goal of making enough progress
that the Committee may not need another meeting. If another meeting is necessary, it can be added. Mr. Hecker requested hard copies again for all the maps and data prior to the next meeting. Mr. Glenn asked, and Chairman Lynn clarified, that the Committee is down to 2b, 2d and 2e as the preferred options.

5. Public Hearing

There were no requests to speak at this time. Written comments were provided to the Committee prior to the meeting and posted on the County’s redistricting webpage [www.pima.gov/countyredistricting](http://www.pima.gov/countyredistricting).

6. Future Agenda Items

The next meeting is scheduled for April 6th and the Committee will meet in person in the Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, from 3-6pm. Chairman Lynn stated that in addition to the public hearing, the bulk of the meeting will be spent looking at those three preferred maps and trying to come to consensus on one of them or a modification of one of them. Chairman Lynn also stated that if Committee members have anything else that they would like the Committee to consider, that they please provide it to staff in advance so that staff can provide the Committee with the full data analysis prior to the meeting. Vice-Chair Romero stated that the key objectives for District 5 are continued representation of Tucson Mountain Park, Saguaro National Park and the Pascua Yaqui Reservation, as well as conformance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm

*For a recording of the meeting, please visit the County’s redistricting webpage at [www.pima.gov/CountyRedistricting](http://www.pima.gov/CountyRedistricting) for the March 23, 2022 YouTube recording link.*
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### Population Deviation (Highest% - Lowest%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rex Scott</td>
<td>Catherine Ripley</td>
<td>208,748</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>173,987</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Matt Hidalgo</td>
<td>Denton Cline</td>
<td>205,820</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>157,496</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sharon Bronse</td>
<td>Maria de Garcia</td>
<td>208,899</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>167,304</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>139,229</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Steve Christy</td>
<td>Meredith Hay</td>
<td>208,780</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>157,496</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Adelita Grijalva</td>
<td>Luis Gonzales</td>
<td>209,245</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>167,449</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>125,415</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The table above shows population deviation for different categories, including age, race, and political affiliation.
- The data includes information on the total population, voting age population, citizen voting age population, and voter registration by percentage.

**Population Deviation Calculation:**

Population Deviation (Highest% - Lowest%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%CVAP</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTING AGE POPULATION</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTING AGE POPULATION</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTING AGE POPULATION</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTING AGE POPULATION</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Census P.L. 94-171 Data (2020 Census); Pima County Recorder (12-6-2021); U.S. Census Bureau 2015-2019 5-Year American Community Survey; ECV (2021)